Note from the Resident Coordinator


Since the beginning of negotiations, several humanitarian indicators improved. Nevertheless, between November 2012 and September 2014, each month nearly 15,000 Colombians were displaced by violence; more than 60,000 people faced restrictions to their freedom of movement; and there was an average of 20 attacks or incidents of improper use of civilian infrastructure. During the peace talks, there have also been more than 1,400 armed events taking place across 25% of the country’s municipalities; 644 people killed or injured by antipersonnel mines; records of 570 children leaving non-state armed groups to enter government rehabilitation programs; and more than 500 victims of sexual violence.

Prior to their declaration of a unilateral ceasefire on December 20 2014, the FARC-EP were the main actors in the Colombian armed conflict. A peace accord with the group would undoubtedly improve the humanitarian situation. Nevertheless, the Ejército de Liberación Nacional (ELN) guerrilla group and paramilitary successor groups (known as post-demobilization armed groups (PDAGs)) are also important actors. Their impact on civilians is of great concern. According to the Victims’ Unit (Unidad de Atención y Reparación Integral a las Víctimas in Spanish), PDAGs are responsible for a fifth of all forced displacements in the country. OCHA data meanwhile suggests that they were involved in more than 70 per cent of all attacks against human rights defenders in 2014.

In this context, the Emergency Response Fund (ERF) played a crucial role in enhancing the humanitarian community’s financial ability to respond to complex emergencies, save lives and address the humanitarian needs of IDPs, confined populations, and children affected by recruitment, among others.

In 2014, the ERF in Colombia financed a greater number of projects compared to 2012 and 2013, with an overall delivery of US$2.9 million. The projects were implemented in eight departments identified as having the largest assistance gaps and most severe humanitarian needs. The Fund brought assistance to more than 52,000 people, of whom 40,000 were indigenous women, men, girls and boys.

Linking the ERF Strategy to the Colombia 2015 SRP helped ensure that the Fund was strategically used to respond to the main emergencies in the country. At the same time, the Fund stimulated response coordination and resource mobilization by donors, implementing partners, state actors and UN Agencies.

Many actors helped make the ERF a rapid and efficient humanitarian mechanism in Colombia in 2014. I would like to especially thank Sweden, Spain, Switzerland and Norway, members of the Advisory Board and Technical Review Committee, national and international NGOs, state entities, OCHA and other UN Agencies. I trust the Fund will continue strengthening humanitarian response and coordination between humanitarian actors and the state during 2015, thanks to the commitment and support of you all.

FABRIZIO HOCHSCHILD
Humanitarian/Resident Coordinator in Colombia
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Executive Summary

Despite an ongoing peace process between the Government and FARC-EP guerrillas, during 2014 Colombia continued to face the consequences of an armed conflicto and violence caused by a host of actors: the FARC-EP and ELN guerrillas, Post-demobilization Armed Groups (PDAGs) and other groups with less clear structures. In 2014, the principal challenges were related to the persistence of the conflict and violence; a proliferation of small criminal groups with less clear links to the organized armed actors and other less visible humanitarian impacts such as limitations on movement and access to basic services caused by violence, disasters or mass protests. Despite major efforts to respond to humanitarian needs, there are persistent gaps in the response, mainly due to an insufficient local response capacity in the areas most affected by violence and natural disasters.

According to the UARIV Government IDP unit, in 2014 cumulative displacement from 1985 reached a total of 6,419,335 people. Afro-colombian and indigenous populations continued to be those most affected by natural disasters and armed conflict, representing 75 per cent of those attended for displacement and other victimizations.

According to OCHA Colombia data, in 2014 the number of IDPs in mass events dropped by 40 per cent as compared to 2013. Nonetheless, these types of emergencies represent only a fraction of all forced displacement in Colombia (7 per cent in 2014, according to official data). The drop in mass displacements does not correspond to a similar drop in armed actions which, on the contrary, according to OCHA data remained stable as compared to 2013 (with a drop of under 10 per cent). In this sense, the drop in the more visible emergencies could be a result of changes in the modus operandi of non-state armed groups, which are avoiding engaging in highly visible actions that lead to a strong Public Forces response. This does not mean, however, a corresponding reduction in humanitarian and protection needs, since the social control exercised by these groups over local communities, movement and goods and services access limitations, and threats and selective violence persist and represent a challenge for humanitarian actors in the country. In 2014, the four departments of the Pacific coast, Chocó, Cauna, Narino and Valle del Cauca, were the location of 85 per cent of all mass displacements. As in previous years, the majority of mass displacements in 2014 were caused by clashes between the Public Forces and the FARC-EP guerrillas, with about half of all cases, followed by unilateral actions by the FARC in 11 per cent of cases and clashes between other armed groups in 11 per cent of cases.

In 2014, 589,786 people suffered severe movement limitations and restrictions in accessing basic goods and services. Events related to the conflict were the cause of 85 per cent of people affected in this way, followed by natural disasters and public order problems connected to mass protests. In 2014, for more than 12,000 people movement restrictions lasted for more than a week and limited their access to three or more basic services (e.g., education, water, food, etc.), which according to OCHA's criteria constitutes a confinement situation. These movement restrictions affected humanitarian actors which could no longer carry out needs evaluations or send aid in an opportune and efficient manner.

Colombia continues to be vulnerable to natural disasters. In 2014, disasters affected at least 1,260,000 people, of whom 730 thousand were affected on the Caribbean coast in La Guajira department, where the prolonged dry season limited access to water, sanitation and food in vulnerable communities. Nearly 300 thousand people were also affected in Chocó, Cauca, Córdoba, Putumayo and Nariño departments, which were areas also

---

1 Source: UARIV - RNI. Cutoff date: 2 February, 2015
2 A mass displacement event is officially defined as an event where 10 or more families, or 50 or more people, displace due to the same causes from the same location.
greatly impacted by armed violence. The number of people affected by natural disasters in 2014 was double the number affected in 2013. It is of concern to the humanitarian community that the most affected areas continue to be highly vulnerable, with high levels of extreme poverty, persistent armed violence and difficult humanitarian access due to geographic and security conditions.

During 2014, the ERF focused its response on humanitarian situations caused by natural disasters and the armed conflict: i/ eight projects were financed to respond to emergencies related to the armed conflict in the departments of Chocó, Cauca, Norte de Santander and Antioquia; ii/ three projects were focused on disaster response in La Guajira and Putumayo departments; iii/ three projects focused on issues related to double affectation of both disasters and conflict. While 2014 was the year with the largest number of approvals for projects (14 in total), it should be mentioned that there were a total of 31 funding requests sent to the fund, which were not approved due to a lack of resources at the moment of the request, or for non-compliance due to programmatic and strategic requirements on the part of the projects requesting funding.

Some 36.4 per cent of funding allocated by the ERF in 2014 corresponded to the WASH sector, followed by 21.8% for shelter, 15% for health, 10% for education in emergencies, 9.8% for food security and nutrition and 7% for protection.

The Fund responded to the main emergencies caused by mass displacement in 2014, namely Guapi and Alto Baudó on the Pacific coast. It also responded to the drought in La Guajira with a WASH intervention.

OCHA led the first process of project review, guaranteeing that projects complied with Fund guidelines and were articulated with the National Strategy of the ERF. The Technical Review Committee, made up of Cluster leads and a focal point from UNFPA-UNWOMEN, carried out a secondary review guaranteeing technical follow-up on the project by sector. The headquarters for the ERF in New York and Geneva supported financial review of projects prior to final approval by the Humanitarian Coordinator. It took an average of 27 days to approve each project by the ERF in 2014.
CHAPTER 1: INFORMATION ON CONTRIBUTORS
The Fund began 2014 with a carry-over of US$2,494,999\(^3\); this sum of money made possible financing of projects during the first semester. During the year the ERF in Colombia received another US$1,738,812, which allowed it to maintain a similar level of financing as compared to 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Decision date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>368,421</td>
<td>1 December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>311,333</td>
<td>5 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>580,131</td>
<td>2 May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>478,927</td>
<td>2 July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,738,812</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2014, the Fund had the support of the principal donors since its creation in 2009, namely Sweden, Spain and Norway. Although donations were confirmed in the first semester of 2014, the respective disbursements occurred in the second semester. In addition, Switzerland made its first contribution in December, in recognition of the results obtained by the Fund, and its good management.

The transfer of funds to the ERF account during the second semester of the year, particularly at the end of the year, was an influencing factor in the high amount of Fund carry-over both for 2014 (US$2.4m) as for 2015 (US$1.2m). Nonetheless, it is important to highlight that the carry-over at the start of 2015 was half of that for 2014, and 68 per cent of that in 2013 (US$3.6m).

The year 2014 was successful for the ERF in Colombia in terms of advances and achievements in its resource mobilization strategy. The Fund received a strong political and economic support from its traditional donors and added Switzerland as a new donor and ERF partner.

The contributions of Spain (US$3.6m), Norway (US$3.5m), Sweden (US$1.5m), Switzerland (US$300k) and San Marino (US$10k) since 2010 and in the subsequent four years has guaranteed the functioning of the Fund in Colombia. As can be seen in graphic no.1, the adjudication of funding has varied year to year:

- **Spain**: The reduction in funding is primarily due to a reduction in international cooperation funds in Colombia over the past several years due to the economic crisis in the country. In 2012, the reduction was around US$500k.
- **Norway**: The reduction in contributions is related to a reduction in cooperation funds for Colombia. At the same time, ERF implementation in 2012 did not meet the donor's expectations. From 2012, there was a cut of US$400k, and from this time funding has been stable at around US$500k.
- **Sweden**: The strategic priorities of the Fund have coincided with the priorities of the Swedish government for Colombia. The effectiveness, coordination and rapidity of implementation for ERF projects motivated a reactivation of contributions by Sweden since 2013. Its latest contributions have been around US$600k.

\(^3\) This elevated amount is due to the fact that donor contributions were made in the second semester of 2013.
- **Switzerland**: Its first participation was in 2014 in different Board meetings, as well as ERF monitoring missions, which increased its familiarity with the advances and progress of the Fund, motivating a contribution at the end of the year.

![Graphic Nº. 1: Contributions by donor (2010-2014)](image)

Finally, it is important to highlight other contributions even when not direct contributions to the fund, which have guaranteed a greater impact in emergencies that were attended, either through co-financing or technical support to ERF projects:

- **ECHO**: Two projects were co-financed by ECHO in 2014 (US$84k). This was to jointly attend communities in Chocó and Norte de Santander affected by the armed conflict. This co-financing occurred since ECHO was an observer of the Advisory Board and has improved direct communication with OCHA. At the same time, the NGOs directly implicated in project co-financing, Lutheran World Federation and Terres des Hommes Italy, led transparent project proposals to receive financing by two donors.

- **United Nations System Agencies**: UNHCR, WFP, IOM, UNICEF, FAO and PAHO-WHO have supported ERF projects when they have a local presence through their technical expertise and/or through their own funding and projects.

- **State entities (UARIV for IDPs, UNGRD for disasters, the Ombudsman’s Office, Mayoral offices and APC cooperation agency)**: in several cases, projects mobilized further funding to continue ERF interventions and/or complement them. For example, the Mayor’s Office in Caldono funded approximately US$68k to improve sanitation in an ERF project.

- **Colombian Red Cross**: the CRC has supported implementing partners on several occasions with the ERF facilitating humanitarian Access to improve response to communities.

- **Implementing Partners**: OXFAM (US$50k), CISP (US$22k), the Colombian Red Cross (US$792k) and Handicap International (US$57k) provided matching funds for projects that were implemented.
- **CERF**: The complementarity between ERF and CERF projects was fundamental to attend several emergencies and maximize resources during 2014. During the approval process for ERF projects, complementarity with CERF was a key criteria, as well as ability to fill gaps encountered during CERF projects. In this sense, technical personnel financed in CERF projects supported certain ERF projects, for example in Chocó, where nutrition personnel financed through CERF supported a nutritional evaluation for ERF beneficiaries in Bojayá. At the same time, it should be highlighted that there was a joint monitoring effort, and the role of agencies to provide technical support to the ERF at the national and local levels through CERF.
CHAPTER 2: ALLOCATION OVERVIEW

2.1 ALLOCATION STRATEGY

In 2014, the Advisory Board approved for the first time the ERF National Strategy. The strategy aligned successfully with the Strategic Response Plan 2014, approved by the Humanitarian Country Team in October of 2013, also for the first time. The HCT based its strategy upon humanitarian needs analyses implemented by the Clusters and LHT, with the facilitation of OCHA.

The Advisory Board defined that ERF resources would be destined to respond rapidly to humanitarian needs, both chronic and sudden, caused by the effects of the conflicto and natural disasters. In this sense, the Fund stipulated that it would destine up to 80 per cent of ERF funds to fill critical gaps in humanitarian response according to a demographic, geographic and sectoral prioritization of the HCT Humanitarian Strategy, in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pacific Coast region and Ecuadorian border: Nariño, Putumayo, Chocó, Valle del Cauca and Cauca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Northwest region: Antioquia and Córdoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Northeast region and Venezuelan border: Arauca and Norte de Santander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Central-east region: southern Tolima, Meta, Guaviare and Caquetá</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recently displaced populations (registered or unregistered) in rural and urban areas who have not received assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Population at risk of displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Population suffering from access limitations, movement restrictions and/or confinement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Population affected by natural disasters, particularly in areas of “double vulnerability” where needs are not covered by State assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Fund also prioritized indigenous and Afro-colombian communities, children and adolescents, the elderly and the disabled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Food security and nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education in emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water, basic sanitation and hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shelter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all sectors, an early recovery link and search for sustainable solutions would be
At the same time, it was stipulated that the Fund would desine up to 20 per cent\(^4\) of ERF resources to finance unforeseen emergencies (sudden, such as natural disasters or conflict such as mass displacement) in areas not prioritized by the SRP.

With the objective of responding to the main humanitarian emergencies in the country, the Advisory Board defined that it would attend sudden and chronic emergencies in the following manner:

- **Sudden emergencies**: sudden or unforeseen emergencies throughout the year, in all departments. All proposals should be based on a MIRA needs evaluation.
- **Chronic emergencies**: to respond to these type of emergencies, the Fund established three rounds of financing during the year. The financing for these types of humanitarian situations was done taking into account the financial status of the ERF in Colombia: for every US$600k available at the beginning of the financing period, a maximum of US$250k would be destined to this type of emergency. The proposals should be based upon a MIRA evaluation and exclusively focused on priority departments. The dates established for financing were the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Periods for project presentation</th>
<th>Periods for review and approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>1 January to 30 April</td>
<td>1 to 19 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>1 May to 31 August</td>
<td>1 to 17 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>1 September to 31 December</td>
<td>1 to 19 January</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All proposals need be socialized with Local Humanitarian Teams to guarantee the coordination of interventions and avoid duplication in humanitarian response. Implementing partners should participate in coordination spaces at the local and national levels, for example, in the Clusters.

Constant communication between OCHA at the national and local level with the humanitarian community and State entities guaranteed the follow-up on the key emergencies in Colombia during 2014. This guaranteed the pertinence of the ERF response as well as its effectiveness and efficiency.

**2.2 ALLOCATION BREAKDOWN**

During 2014, the Fund financed 14 projects in Colombia for a total amount of US$2,858,032, the Fund approved US$600k more than in 2013. The projects adjudicated in accord with the National ERF Strategy were as follows:

**Financing Modality**: The Fund received 31 financing requests for a total amount of US$6.5m. Of these 18 were for sudden emergencies (US$3.8m) and 13 for chronic emergencies (US$2.7m). As can be seen in graphic no. 2, there were fewer resources approved for both chronic and sudden emergencies. Of the 18 requests received for sudden emergencies, 7 project proposals were rejected as they failed to meet the programmatic and strategic

---

\(^4\) The OXFAM project approved in Guajira was the only project approved in areas not prioritized by the SRP. This project represents the 10% of the total amount allocated by ERF during 2014.
requirements of the Fund. Another 7 of 10 projects rejected for chronic emergencies were not financed due to a lack of funds.

**Graphic No. 2: Financing requests vs. Resources allocated (2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Application for funding</th>
<th>Approved amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic emergencies</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudden emergencies</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Million of dollars**

**Organization type:** Of the 14 projects approved in 2014, 11 were adjudicated to international NGOs, 2 to national NGOs and 1 to an international NGO in association with a national NGO. There was no financing of UNS Agency projects as seen in graphic no. 3.

**Graphic No. 3 Type of organization financed**

- National NGO 7%
- International NGO 14%
- Partnership between national and international NGOs 75%

**Sectors:** the sectors most financed by ERF in 2014 were WASH and Shelter/CCCM. A contribution from the Education in Emergencies Fund should be highlighted in the case of Norte de Santander department, and the focus on rights, gender and early recover transversally in all projects, see graphic no. 4.
Graphic No 4: Sectors financed (2014)
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Geographic location: During 2014, the Fund financed projects in seven of thirteen departments prioritized by the SRP and Fund Strategy. In addition, it adjudicated resources to La Guajira (which was not prioritized by the SRP) to respond to the sudden emergency in that area, a major drought.
2.3 FUND PERFORMANCE

In compliance with the National ERF Strategy, the Fund in 2014 attended two types of emergencies:

- **Sudden emergencies**: 11 emergencies were attended throughout the year; the first semester concentrated most of these types of emergencies.
- **Chronic emergencies**: A total of 6 emergencies were attended through three financing rounds. The third round closed on 31 December 2014, in which three projects were approved, these will be accounted for in the 2015 report.

In 2014, the OCHA office strengthened the Humanitarian Financing Unit with a restructuring and the support from several OCHA unit to support Fund administration and management. This restructuring guaranteed improved project monitoring and process review and Fund approval. The approval of projects averaged 27 days in 2014.

The Fund adjudication strategy also allowed for assistance to highly vulnerable populations: indigenous, Afro-colombian, IDPs, women, children and adolescents. Some 76 per cent of beneficiaries attended by ERF projects were from indigenous communities, many of those at risk of extinction.

The pertinence and effectiveness in ERF project adjudication should be highlighted for both sudden and chronic emergencies, which was strengthened by the Humanitarian Coordinator, with the support of OCHA at the national and local levels and the State and humanitarian community throughout the country.

During the ERF project cycle (formulation, approval, implementation, monitoring and closure), coordination was a fundamental area of action. OCHA guaranteed that different parts of the humanitarian system were involved in projects in the following manner:

- **Local Humanitarian Teams**: through OCHA colleagues in the field, coordination was guaranteed with implementing organizations, NGOs, UNS Agencies and State entities. At the same time, financing requests had to be socialized and discussed in the LHT to guarantee their pertinence and avoid duplication in emergency response.
- **National State Entities**: in regular OCHA meetings with State entities including UARIV, UNGRD and APC, reports were made on ERF attended emergencies. At the same time, the UARIV was included as a new member of the Advisory Board.
- **Clusters**: Cluster members have been actively involved in the ERF Technical Review Committee through the review and project monitoring processes.
- **HCT**: periodic reports were made on responses to the main emergencies attended.
- **Humanitarian Donor Group**: the meetings of this group guaranteed the coordination and Exchange of information on project monitoring; visits to the field were promoted jointly and financing was discussed for particular organizations and emergencies.

In order to promote the association of national and international NGOs for emergency response, OCHA carried out a calendar of trainings on ERF at both the local and national levels. During these workshops, national and international NGOs participated, as well as the Colombian Red Cross, State entities and UNS Agencies. OCHA was in constant communication with its implementing partners throughout 2014. At the same time, OCHA accompanied national and international NGOs in project proposal formulation and implementation, particularly with those with technical and organizational weaknesses.
Project monitoring and follow-up:

ERF project monitoring and follow-up is a high priority for OCHA Colombia. Through adequate project monitoring, field coordination is improved, as well as information and analysis on humanitarian situations, and accountability is promoted to affected populations, donors and humanitarian partners generally.

The monitoring and follow-up strategy was strengthened through:

- Implementation of standardized reporting formats through which information collection was guaranteed so that quality and comparability is maintained.
- Definition of a mission calendar for ERF project monitoring. This mechanism has allowed for the sharing and coordination with ERF donors and ERF Technical Review Committee members in monitoring missions, favoring their active participation throughout the project cycle.
- Training OCHA field officers on ERF mechanisms and their role in monitoring and follow-up.

In the period there were 22 monitoring missions by OCHA personnel through ongoing ERF projects.

Gender focus:

All Fund projects were formulated and implemented taking into account a gender focus and the recommendations of the UNWOMEN-UNFPA focal point, providing support to fund requesting organizations throughout the review process on the review committee. At the same time, since the second quarter of 2014, all projects approved received a gender marker, responding to the recommendations of the Advisory Board. Nonetheless, there are still challenges in this area, since of 11 projects receiving a gender marker in 2014, 6 were marked as 2a and 5 as 1. ERF projects took into account the needs of children, adolescents, women and men; promoting equity in gender roles, decision-making and activities.

Of the 52,372 ERF beneficiaries in 2014, 24 per cent were women, 23 per cent men, 26 per cent girls and 27 per cent boys. For several projects, gender focus was a challenge, taking into account the social structures present in indigenous communities and the social control of the guerrillas. Nonetheless, activities were promoted to strengthen the role of women in decision-making and their active participation in project activities.

**Graphic N° 5**

Benefits by Gender (2010-2014)

- Total women (children and adults)
- Total men (children and adults)
It should be highlighted that, usually, on project finalization, implementing organizations register a larger number of beneficiaries than at their onset. The calculations used for this report were made exclusively based upon the 7 final reports. For this reason it is expected that in April or May 2015, the real number of ERF beneficiaries in 2014 will be disaggregated by gender.
CHAPTER 3: ALLOCATION RESULTS

3.1 Water, Basic Sanitation and Hygiene

The WASH Cluster had three objectives in its response plan for 2014:

- To aid and contribute to improve Access to water, sanitation and hygiene services in accord with the SRP’s geographic and demographic prioritizations.
- To guarantee access to appropriate technologies and mechanisms to improve basic sanitation at the family and community levels.
- To guarantee the reception of training on the importance of good hygiene practices and their direct relationship with health.

Through ERF project financing, the three objectives of the WASH Cluster were advanced:

- Access to hard to reach locations: for example, assistance to the Hitnu indigenous community of Arauca department, where 2 windmills and 55 water provision systems were built.
- Response to sudden emergencies, such as response to the La Guajira drought emergency, where safe water access was guaranteed through 6 wells.
- Project implementation in 6 of 13 departments prioritized by the SRP.

---

![Image of water distribution system in a rural area.](image)

---

### WASH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinator Co facilitator</th>
<th>UNICEF PAHO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Counterpart</td>
<td>Viceministerio de Agua Potable y Saneamiento Básico - VASB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Population SRF</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population covered by ERF projects</th>
<th>Total Population: 47,425</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Women:</td>
<td>11,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Men:</td>
<td>10,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Girls:</td>
<td>22,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Boys:</td>
<td>12,981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Indigineous Population: 36,095 |
| Afro Colombian Population: 2,226 |

### Departements covered by ERF projects

- Arauca
- Choco
- Valle del Cauca
- Norte de Santander
- Putumayo
- Guajira
- Antioquia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Fund required by SRP</th>
<th>Fund received in 2014</th>
<th>Fund allocated by ERF in 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28M</td>
<td>8.1M</td>
<td>1.04M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ERF projects guaranteed the distribution of filters, the rehabilitation and construction of water provision systems and the construction of water and sanitation systems at the community level, but also respective training to promote the good use of these technologies and intervention sustainability.

The workshops and activities carried out took into account differences between women, men, boys, girls and the elderly and youths, as well as the cultural particularities of each community.

---

Credit: Cruz Roja Colombia
3.2 Food Security and Nutrition

The Food Security and Nutrition Cluster had five objectives in its 2014 response plan:

- To reduce food assistance gaps for 556,612 people affected by conflict and natural disasters in 2014 in an opportune and coordinated manner.
- To reduce the prevalence of acute malnutrition among children under 5 and nutritional deficiencies for 30,000 people.
- To strengthen agricultural livelihoods for at least 109 thousand people in communities affected by conflict and/or natural disasters.
- To incorporate concrete actions in early recovery, institutional sustainability and risk management in all food security and nutrition activities selected during 2014.
- To improve the visibility of the impact of conflict and humanitarian needs in food security and nutrition in order to promote an effective and opportune response and to mobilize resources for the affected population.

Through ERF project financing, the Cluster objectives were advanced, particularly in terms of benefits to indigenous communities affected by the armed conflict and natural disasters located in remote locations with a low institutional presence. For example, the indigenous communities on the Pogue and Uva rivers in Bojayá, Chocó, received assistance. In this project rooftop gardens were built for family crops and seeds were distributed to guarantee food security and nutrition in the communities.

For this project, a gender focus was promoted through the stimulation of the participation of women in collective decision-making. For example, decisions on seed planting and crop choices.
3.3 Shelter/CCCM

The Shelter cluster had two objectives in its 2014 response plan:

- To attend communities affected by natural disasters and/or armed conflict with coordination, temporary shelter and non-food item requirement assistance, including infrastructure repair and construction.
- To provide humanitarian assistance in the shelter/CCCM sector for complex emergency situations based on efficient coordination processes and the strengthening of institutional rapid response capacity.

Through ERF financing, response was implemented to sudden and chronic emergencies in the Shelter-CCCM sector in the departments of Arauca, Valle del Cauca and Antioquia. With these interventions, indigenous and Afro-colombian populations benefited.

Of ERF financed projects in the shelter sector, of particular note was the construction of a mobile shelter for Guapi municipality in Cauca. The displacements in this municipality are recurring, for which reason the intervention was agreed on and evaluated as pertinent by the HCT, ICC and LHT of Valle/Cauca.

The year 2014 was the year with the highest amount approved by the ERF for the Shelter-CCCM sector. Some

37 per cent of funds received in this sector were through the ERF.
3.4 Education in Emergencies:

The Education in Emergencies response plan for 2014 took into account three objectives:

- To facilitate a more predictable, relevant and accountable response in education in emergencies.
- To promote risk mitigation for communities affected by the armed conflict strengthening response capacities and community and institutional resilience.
- To advocate for public policies through knowledge management related to the protection of the right to education for children in emergency contexts.

Through ERF financing resources were adjudicated to improve school infrastructure in Buenaventura (Valle del Cauca), El Tarra and Tibú (Norte De Santander). Through ERF projects, humanitarian emergency response was implemented in areas with a scarce international and institutional response.

Norwegian Refugee Council, Terre des Hommes and Solidaridad Internacional were the main ERF implementing partners in this sector. With 86 per cent of ERF funding going to Norte de Santander.

The ERF also attended the rivers of Buenaventura which were affected by flooding in October and November 2013, the ERF prioritized Education in Emergencies sector as an emergency response since nearly 181 children needed improvements to children’s homes which had been damaged, as well as teaching materials in the schools. At the same time, this intervention was evaluated positively due to its work in this sector and the promotion of schools as protective spaces for children in conflicts.

---

### Education in Emergencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinator Co facilitator</th>
<th>UNICEF Norwegian Refugee Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Counterpart</td>
<td>Ministerio de Educación Nacional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Population SRP</td>
<td>61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population covered by ERF projects</td>
<td>Total Population: 8,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Women: 2,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Men: 1,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Girls: 2,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Boys: 2,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous Population: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afro Colombian Population: 2,226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Departements covered by ERF projects

- Norte de Santander
- Valle del Cauca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund required by 2014</th>
<th>Fund received in 2014</th>
<th>Fund allocated by ERF in 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,1 M</td>
<td>4 M</td>
<td>0,28 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Protection:

The Protection Cluster response plan had three objectives for 2014:

- To advocate in concrete cases before the competent national and local authorities or remit cases to the agency with a mandate to respond.
- To establish and maintain appropriate humanitarian coordination mechanisms and to establish case referral systems.
- A common positioning of issues and guidelines to facilitate Protection Cluster, ICC and HCT dialogue.

Through the protection focus projects were financed in Norte de Santander and Antioquia. Nonetheless, it should be noted that all projects had a transversal protection focus.

In this sector, work in child protection to reduce armed group recruitment should be noted, as well as access to remote or difficult locations, and a work in schools as protection areas. All ERF projects benefited indigenous and Afro-colombian communities; they promoted a rights-based focus and gender-focus in their activities.

During 2014, assistance should be noted in 10 indigenous communities in the Bajo Cauca region of Antioquia, where rights strengthening, access to rights and mine risk education were important activities. These communities were affected in terms of mobility due to landmine placement around their crops. The project was presented by Handicap International in conjunction with the Organización Indígena de Antioquia.
3.6 Health:

The Health cluster had four objectives in their response plan for 2014:

- To reduce gaps in integral healthcare identified in IDP and disaster affected populations, or in public health emergencies.
- To support the strengthening of the healthcare system in preparation and response to natural disaster, complex emergency or public health events.
- To advance in the consolidation of a healthcare information system with a differential, regular, standardized and opportune focus.
- To consolidate the Health cluster as a facilitator and technical-scientific trainer in humanitarian healthcare response.

Through ERF projects the first objective of the Health cluster was guaranteed as well as Access to hard-to-reach communities where institutional presence is limited.

The most complete ERF intervention in the health sector was part of a response to the forced displacement of 21 Embera Dobidá communities in rural Alto Baudó, Chocó.

The limited response and deplorable humanitarian conditions in the indigenous reservation, as well as nearby areas in Catrú, mobilized the LHT of Chocó and ICC to implement a MIRA evaluation. Based upon these results, ERF projects were formulated for the Health sector.

Due to the high suicide rates in the Embera communities, mental healthcare was prioritized with a psychosocial support program using an ethnic focus to attend post-traumatic stress disorder in emergency situations. This type of healthcare assistance was a novelty for the Fund. There was a positive evaluation of the accompaniment of PAHO-WHO in the ERF project monitoring in Alto Baudó municipality.
CHAPTER 4: ACCOUNTABILITY AND RISK MANAGEMENT

With the goal of improving ERF resource administration, OCHA identified a series of risks that impede the optimum functioning of the Fund; at the same time, it implemented a series of administrative-programmatic measures to mitigate these risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>2014 Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic and Programmatic</td>
<td>Poor and inadequate identification of emergency humanitarian needs.</td>
<td>Promotion of effective response, with an application of multisectoral evaluations.</td>
<td>MIRA was established as obligatory to present ERF project proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitless clarity on Fund priorities and operations</td>
<td>Implementing partners should recognize priorities to promote rapid and strategic response; as well as to reduce the percentage of projects rejected.</td>
<td>Workshops carried out in Chocó, Nariño, Norte de Santander, Meta, Arauca and Córdoba. At the same time, workshop developed for the Colombian Red Cross and NGOs nationwide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of strategic objectives for the Fund</td>
<td>It is important to define strategically how to adjudicate Fund resources.</td>
<td>The construction of a National Fund Strategy aligned with the SRP and approved by the ERF Advisory Board in April.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Governance and administration</td>
<td>A lack of awareness on Fund administration and guidelines</td>
<td>It is important that OCHA understand the guidelines and to appropriate administration of the ERF.</td>
<td>A constant request for support from the ERF HQ in New York and Geneva to understand and improve compliance with Fund guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No donor contributions or late contributions</td>
<td>It is important that the Fund have resources throughout the year and not lack a response capacity</td>
<td>A resource mobilization strategy was created and implemented. Constant communication maintained on the financial status of the ERF with donors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays in second allotment disbursement and in audits</td>
<td>It should be noted to activate the auditing process and pay the second disbursement according to Fund guidelines.</td>
<td>A Long Term Agreement was contracted with an auditing firm to facilitate the immediate activation of audits for projects finalized in 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Fraud-Corruption</td>
<td>It is important to have measures to avoid the loss of resources from the Fund.</td>
<td>Careful monitoring of financial reports and the support of the Auditing firm with recommendations on measures to take into account by implementing partners for the adequate administration of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of property</td>
<td>It is important to guarantee the return of properties to the ERF in accord with signed contracts with implementing partners.</td>
<td>The Fund began monitoring of all property that was financed and promoted its reintegration or formal donation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Insufficient project monitoring</td>
<td>It is important to monitor and follow-up adequately with all</td>
<td>OCHA increased the frequency of its meetings, project visits and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination and Association</th>
<th>Non-participation by implementing partners in national and local coordination spaces.</th>
<th>It is important to have implementing partners participate in existing humanitarian coordination spaces.</th>
<th>OCHA invited all implementing partners to participate in coordination spaces, with a particular emphasis on national NGOs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty in working with State authorities</td>
<td>It is necessary to have good relationships and communications with national and local State authorities in emergency response.</td>
<td>OCHA exchanged information with the UARIV, UNGRD and APC at the national level. It also promoted implementing partners having constant dialogues with the local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks / threats</td>
<td>Non-entrance to communities</td>
<td>For reasons of public order situations and/or natural disasters, the implementation of projects may be adversely affected.</td>
<td>OCHA took decisions and measures as pertained to the case at hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insecurity for local implementing partners.</td>
<td>Several projects are in areas with a high presence of non-state armed groups. Implementing partners should take protection measures.</td>
<td>OCHA allowed for the use of the United Nations logo to guarantee access in several areas around the country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To guarantee constant accountability throughout the humanitarian community, donors, implementing partners, agencies, local authorities, the Fund carried out:

- Quarterly infographics
- Quarterly reports
- Bilateral meetings with donors
- Bilateral meetings with State authorities
- Constant information Exchange with Clusters and field partners
- Strategic news and report publication through Salahumanitaria.co
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND WAY FORWARD

The ERF continues to function as a pertinent and necessary humanitarian response mechanism, and should be maintained during 2015. The peace talks underway increase the possibility of a transition in Colombia. Nonetheless, the ongoing conflict and gap in humanitarian response is critical in many areas of the country, for which reason the ERF focused its response in 2014 and will continue to respond in 2015. Following are the main conclusions for the period in question:

Increase to adjudicated funding: The ERF financed 14 projects for a total of US$2.8 million, which represents a major increase in funding as compared to 2012, when only US$500,000 was approved in two projects.

Reduction in review and approval times: OCHA Colombia carried out an internal restructuring of the Office, strategically positioning personnel for humanitarian financing and promoting the commitment of the entire Office to the topic. This allowed OCHA personnel to increase their awareness of Fund guidelines, which improved an effective use of the same.

Improvements to Fund governance: With the leadership of the Humanitarian Coordinator, the Advisory Board managed to define strategic objectives for Fund operations. For its part, the Technical Review Committee improved its involvement with Fund processes, considerably reducing review times and facilitating a technical accompaniment with implementing partners. This has favored a positioning of the ERF as an efficient and rapid financing mechanism through LHT members, Cluster leads and implementing partners.

Response focused on the most vulnerable populations: Of the more than 52 thousand Colombians to receive humanitarian assistance to improve conditions in food security and nutrition, health, education in emergencies, shelter, protection and WASH, some 77 per cent were from indigenous communities, some at risk of extinction, who received an assistance with an ethnic and protection focus. In addition, 5 per cent of beneficiaries were from Afro-colombian communities, principally affected by forced displacement. This reflects an alignment of the ERF with the strategic priorities identified by the HCT through the SRP and HNO.

Definition of National ERF Strategy: The construction and implementation of a strategy to adjudicate resources articulated with SRP strategic priorities, guaranteeing the allotment of resources to projects that are pertinent and contribute to Cluster response plans.

Construction of Resource Mobilization Strategy: the commitment of the Advisory Board, under the leadership of the HC, allowed for the construction and implementation of the strategy. As a result, the Fund achieved a contribution from Switzerland for the first time in 2014, and the continuing commitment of traditional donors including Sweden, Spain and Norway.

Elaboration of information products on the Fund: OCHA began starting in 2014 the preparation of quarterly infographics. These products allow for improved accountability together with the Advisory Board, as donors, implementing partners and Colombian State entities. It should be highlighted that these products have improved transparency in resource management and increased confidence in OCHA as an ERF administrator.

100% of projects monitored: OCHA performed follow-up and monitoring of all approved and ongoing projects (those approved in 2013) during 2014.
Financing and Budget availability: due to the high rate of funding requests, the Fund requires an increase in contributions from its donors in 2015, and should try to achieve these donations during the first semester of the year.

ERF strategy in a post-accord scenario: The Fund should create an intervention strategy in accord with a potential post-accord scenario.
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